**Offcase**

**Politics**

**The bill will pass- multiple reasons**

**UQ: Barro 7-10** (Josh, Politics Editor for Business Insider, “IT'S ALIVE: Stop Saying Immigration Reform Is Dead,” http://www.businessinsider.com/its-alive-stop-saying-immigration-reform-is-dead-2013-7, ME”

I jumped the gun last month when I wrote a piece with the unfortunate headline "IT'S OVER: Comprehensive Immigration Reform Is Going To Pass."¶ Obviously, **immigration reform is on the rocks. But its death is being greatly exaggerated in the media.**¶ Republicans and Democrats in Congress both have reasons to signal inflexibility on the content of an immigration bill, regardless of how inflexible they actually are.¶ **Speaker John Boehner needs to convince Democrats that Republicans are willing to kill the bill without major policy concessions**. **Democrats**, like Chuck Schumer, need to convince Republicans that they **are willing to let the bill die rather than give up desired elements like the pathway to citizenship**.¶ Jon Ward of the Huffington Post lays out **how this needle could theoretically be threaded. It would involve replacing the Path to Citizenship** which so alarms many House Republicans **with** something less, along the lines of Sen. Rand Paul's "No New Path To Citizenship" proposal.¶ You can call it **a Pathway to Legalization—unauthorized immigrants would get the right to stay in the country legally and could pursue citizenship if they become eligible through existing legal channels,** but would not get a separately established right to apply for Permanent Resident status after 10 years.¶ I spoke this afternoon with Sean West, Director of Eurasia Group's U.S. practice, who is reiterating his call that there is a 60% chance of immigration reform's passage this year. But he thinks the bill that passes may not involve a path to citizenship.¶ **There are two key questions about this approach: Could it be acceptable to a majority of House Republicans, and could Democrats swallow hard and accept it? The answer to both is maybe**.¶ Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee and is generally viewed as an immigration skeptic, favors such an approach. So does Paul, who ended up voting against the Senate bill because of concerns about the path to citizenship and border security.¶ **A path to legalization without citizenship would satisfy the needs of Republican-aligned business interests**, which just want to be able to hire immigrant workers**. And it could calm worries among Republicans wary of granting citizenship to members of a likely Democratic voting block**.¶ Of course, **Democrats have repeatedly insisted that immigration reform isn't comprehensive if it doesn't contain a path to citizenship. But if they're presented with a bill that serves most of their other goals, will they really turn it down?** There are a few reasons **they shouldn't**.¶ Legalization would lead to a major advance in quality of life for unauthorized immigrants even if it didn't come with a path to citizenship. **A substantial fraction of newly-legalized immigrants would later become eligible for citizenship through existing channels, such as marriage to a citizen or sponsorship by a relative, even without a special path**.¶ Perhaps **most importantly, legalization would bring formerly unauthorized immigrants out of the shadows and enable them to lobby for a path to citizenship in the future**. Even the path to citizenship in the Senate immigration bill wouldn't lead to the creation of any new U.S. citizens until 2026. Democrats will almost surely control the whole federal government at some point between now and then, so if t**here's no path to citizenship in an immigration bill passed this year, they will likely be able to enact one later.**¶ Of course, that reason for Democrats to accept a bill with no path to citizenship is a reason for Republicans to resist passing one. But there are still good reasons for House **Republicans to feel they have to pass something**.¶ Business interests and the **Republican elites that align closely with them desperately want an immigration bill**. They haven't given up: Grover Norquist, Al Cardenas and Doug Holtz-Eakin came out with another letter yesterday urging Boehner to pass something.¶ **If the House doesn't pass any immigration bill, they will have to take all of the blame for reform getting defeated, alienating not just Hispanics but many of the top funders of Republican politics**.¶ When I asked this morning on Twitter about the last time Republican elites fought so hard for something and got rebuked by their own elected officials, the proffered examples were not on point: TARP. "Plan B" for the fiscal cliff. This year's farm bill.¶ House Republicans defected on TARP and changed their mind less than two weeks later. When Plan B got defeated, Boehner had no choice but to let a substantively similar (actually, farther left) bill pass with mostly Democratic votes. Everybody expects the House to eventually pass a farm bill, too. In each case, **the elites eventually got (or will get) more or less what they want.¶** If House Republicans pass a bill with no path to citizenship, they'll be able to accurately tell business interests that they passed legislation addressing their priorities, Hispanics that they voted for a bill that changes immigration in a way that substantially betters the lives of immigrants, and conservatives that they didn't just roll over to Democratic priorities. The politics are drastically better than not passing anything at all.¶ And passing such a bill would put Democrats in a challenging political position. Can Schumer really make good on his threat not to go to conference with a House bill that doesn't have a path to citizenship? If he did, he'd give Republicans an opening to credibly declare that Democrats killed immigration reform because they'd rather have a political issue than a law that advances many, if not all, of their policy objectives.¶ A lot of the discussion around immigration reform has focused on two possible outcomes: passage of a bill substantially identical to the Gang of Eight approach, or no bill. But **the possibility of a bill that is more limited in scope and more attuned to Republican interests should not be discounted. Don't call immigration reform dead yet.**

**Engaging Mexico drains PC**

**Farnsworth 12** – VP of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society (Eric, “The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward”, Nov 30, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/>, CMR)

**The election of** Enrique Peña **Nieto and the re-election of** President **Obama mean** that **the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border**. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, **both sides must invest political capital** **and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining** why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### Unique link – major shifts in policy towards Latin America cause partisan battles

Whitehead & Nolte 12 (Laurence Whitehead, senior research fellow in politics at Nuffield College, Oxford, and Detlef Nolte, acting president of the GIGA, director of the GIGA Institute of Latin American Studies, professor of political science at the University of Hamburg, Number 6, 2012, <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1206.pdf>, CMR)

US–Latin America relations are routinely managed by multiple bureaucratic agencies, which can act quite autonomously and are often not coordinated via a common ¶ strategy. Obama’s Latin America policy has frequently been hampered by political ¶ polarization and partisan divisions in Congress. „ The intermestic dimension of US–Latin American relations has complicated foreign ¶ policy, because a more self-confident and autonomous majority in Latin America ¶ has sometimes sought a policy shift with regard to highly sensitive topics, such as ¶ drugs, immigration and Cuba.¶ „ One issue area where some would criticize the Obama administration is its slowness ¶ in improving relations with Brazil or placing Brazil on par with, for example, India.¶ „ It is unlikely that Latin America’s modest ranking in US foreign policy will increase ¶ or that Washington’s priorities will shift much after the November 2012 elections

**Immigration reform is key to the economy, competitiveness, and hegemony**

**Shapiro 3/27** --- president and CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, the U.S. trade association representing more than 2,000 consumer electronics companies (Gary, “Tech Executives: Immigration Reform a Top Priority”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/garyshapiro/2013/03/27/tech-executives-immigration-reform-a-top-priority/>, CMR)

Today I join hundreds of leaders in business, finance, technology and policymaking in Silicon Valley for the 2013 Global Technology Symposium. This year’s theme is “Entrepreneurship in the Global World,” a timely subject given the technology community’s leadership in **supporting skilled-immigration reform, an issue intertwined with entrepreneurship and America’s standing in the global economy**.¶ **Entrepreneurship is a key component of** **“ninja innovation**,” a term I coined to describe **the principle**s **we must embrace** if we’re going to success in business, politics or our personal lives. I look forward to talking more about this important connection at the symposium tonight, but at the core of the discussion is a simple truth: More than being entrepreneurial individuals, **we must foster a culture of entrepreneurship in America**. **That includes finding ways to attract and keep the world’s best and brightest innovators in America to develop products, launch companies, and create jobs**.¶ CEOs from AT&T, Cisco, eBay, Facebook, Google, Intel and Yahoo! have led a steady drumbeat in Washington to reform America’s skilled-immigration system. They understand why **reform is vital to our nation’s economic well-being**.¶ **It fuels job creation**.¶ A recent study found that **the average foreign-born student who graduates from a U.S. university and works in a STEM field** – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – **will create** about **2.62 jobs** for American workers.¶ Creating an immigration system that welcomes the world’s best and brightest is not only crucial to our nation but also to the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara economy, home to thousands of STEM jobs. A 2011 Bureau of Labor Statistics report finds that STEM occupations accounted for at least 15 percent of total jobs in this area – that’s more than three times the percentage for the U.S. as a whole.¶ That’s why earlier this month, more than 100 executives from the technology sector and leading innovation advocacy organizations, including my organization, the Consumer Electronics Association (CEA)®, signed a letter to President Obama and Congress urging them to create a more open and flexible U.S. immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers.¶ Cisco Chairman and CEO John Chambers said it best, “America’s success has been based upon its ability to attract the best, brightest, and most ambitious individuals. **Our country needs a modern immigration policy that further fosters this culture to help spur continued tech**nological **innovation and economic growth**.”¶ The problem is clearest in the technology industry because of the incredible shortage of qualified workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, **there are tens of thousands of unfilled jobs requiring highly skilled individuals in STEM fields**. Among four top tech firms – IBM, Intel, Microsoft and Oracle – there are 10,000 jobs waiting to be filled.¶ **Our outdated and inefficient immigration system is a huge contributor to the shortage**. **Many high-skilled, foreign-born workers want to come to or stay in America and create jobs here, but our restrictive visa laws send them home after they’ve trained in our universities**. **Silicon Valley has felt the pain of these policies through a drop in the number of startups founded by foreign-born immigrants**. In the past seven years, **immigrants founded 43.9 percent of startups**, down from 52.4 percent in 2005. **Pushing these individuals to the back of the immigration line creates an incentive for them to compete against us by working for other companies abroad**.¶ Instead, we should implement reforms like the Immigration Innovation Act, which would nearly double the number of H-1B visas for high-skilled foreign workers.¶ Other measures, like the Start-Up Visa Act, introduced in the Senate, would also encourage innovation here in the U.S. while investing in education for those in STEM fields. These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter to President Obama and Congress as ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. But that doesn’t mean that if Congress and the President fail to enact them the technology industry will not surrender its fight for reform.¶ The Startup Act 3.0 would enhance America’s global competitiveness by encouraging more entrepreneurialism and halt the U.S. brain drain by creating a STEM visa program for up to 50,000 immigrants each year who graduate from U.S. institutions with a master’s or Ph.D. in STEM. It would also create an entrepreneur visa for up to 75,000 immigrant entrepreneurs who register a business, hire at least two non-family member employees, and invest in their business within one year of obtaining the visa.¶ These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. If Congress and the President fail to enact them, the technology industry will keep fighting for reform.¶ After all, the understanding that strategic immigration is good for our economy is gaining traction among the broader public as well. A recent survey found that there is strong desire among likely voters to have an open and flexible immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers. It also found broad support for research and development programs and a stronger federal focus on STEM education. This may be because Americans are becoming increasingly worried that we are losing our global advantage. More Americans believe that the next major technological innovation will come from China (43 percent) rather than from America (30 percent).¶ With the support of most Americans and the bold leadership of tech industry executives, skilled immigration reform should be a no-brainer in Washington. **Bipartisan reform is an important and** remarkably **easy way to help create jobs and innovation at home. We need to keep America in a position of global leadership**, **and reforming our** country’s **immigration law is the first step**.

**Collapse of US leadership causes great power war and extinction**

**Barnett 11** (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7, CMR)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for **Americans** that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower.** Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization**, **the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. **Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century**, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.**  But **the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war**. **Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. **We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** **and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war.** We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms**, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

**Renewables 1NC**

**A. Uniqueness – Mexico’s oil production is tanking**

**Krauss and Malkin ’10** (“Mexico Oil Politics Keeps Riches Just Out of Reach” New York Times, Clifford Krauss and Elisabeth Malkin, March 8, 2010 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/09/business/global/09pemex.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

In all, Mexican oil output has dropped from just short of 3.5 million barrels a day in 2004 to a projected average of 2.5 million barrels this year. Mexican oil exports to the United States, now 1.1 million barrels a day, have fallen by nearly a third in the last six years. The United States Energy Department projects that Mexican production will decline by an additional 600,000 barrels a day by 2020; combined with growing domestic demand, that would probably make the country an oil importer. In the last two years, Mexico provided about 12 percent of all crude oil imports to the United States, supplying about 8 percent of the total oil used by American refineries, according to the Energy Department. Pemex — officially Petróleos Mexicanos — is the most important company in Mexico, employing 140,000 people. Oil money is used for everything from building schools to fighting the war against drug cartels. “The fact that Mexico’s production is rapidly declining could potentially cause a financial crisis not only for Pemex but for the government,” said Enrique Sira, the Mexico director of IHS Cera, an energy consulting firm. Mexican officials put the best face on the situation, hailing a reform package passed by Congress two years ago that gives Pemex more independence and leeway in negotiating service contracts with foreign firms. “There is nothing to stop us from improving,” Pemex’s director general, Juan José Suárez Coppel, said at a recent university conference. In an interview, the Mexican energy secretary, Georgina Kessel, said she expected the drop in oil production to level off this year, “and we can begin on the road back toward reversing the fall in production in the coming years.” To accomplish that, Ms. Kessel said, “Mexico is going to have to go to the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico,” where she estimated there are at least 50 billion barrels in potential oil reserves — more than double the country’s current proven reserves. International oil executives share the enthusiasm for Mexico’s potential deepwater fields, which lie near rich new American fields. Mexico “potentially has, if not the largest, one of the largest undiscovered deepwater petroleum resources in the world,” said Jon Blickwede, a senior geologist at Statoil, a Norwegian oil company active in the Gulf. Pemex has stepped up exploration of its deep waters, but it will take specialized expertise and enormous financing to produce oil there. Just one deepwater rig can cost $365 million a year to operate, which is why even companies the size of Chevron and Shell look for partners to share the financial risk. Carlos Morales, head of Pemex production and exploration, said in an interview that the company was in advanced discussions with foreign companies to develop “new models” of contracts to share costs and technology on land and offshore that would include cash payments. “Without doubt, Pemex is in a key moment in its history,” he said. Like the government, international oil executives said they were cautiously optimistic some arrangement with Pemex could be worked out. But in the best case, it will be 10 or 15 years before significant production can begin in the deep gulf — and by then, Mexico could already be an oil importer. Stumbling blocks remain. The recent reforms do not lift constitutional prohibitions that effectively prevent foreign companies from booking Mexican reserves they help discover, which undermines their incentive to sign deals with Pemex. The Mexican government hopes to interpret the new rules to allow foreign firms to share the profits of new discoveries, but opposition political parties have filed a constitutional challenge to the rules. The case is before the Mexican Supreme Court. The 1938 nationalization, by the leftist government of Lázaro Cárdenas, came at the end of a long period of revolutionary ferment in Mexico. It occurred amid rising tensions between foreign oil interests, including American companies, and Mexican workers who felt they were being exploited. Schoolchildren learn about it as one of the great assertions of Mexican sovereignty. An outright reversal of that act is unthinkable in Mexican politics. Carlos Fuentes, the Mexican novelist and former ambassador, said any government leader who would try to change the legal status of oil “would be hanged in the Zócalo,” referring to Mexico City’s main square, though he personally would like to see some arrangement with foreign oil companies worked out. As a symbol of nationalism and sovereignty, Pemex is run like a government agency, not an oil company. Its budget is set by the Congress, so it cannot plan exploration far in advance. It is burdened by taxes, debt and pension liabilities that limit its ability to spend money discovering new fields. Mexico’s most important field has long been Cantarell. When production first faltered in the late 1990s, Pemex injected huge amounts of nitrogen gas to raise the pressure and increase production. But experts say the company may have gone overboard, bolstering production so much that the eventual collapse was accelerated. With production in deep gulf waters still a distant dream, the hope of stabilizing Mexico’s production has centered on the Chicontepec field here, on land. But Pemex’s production forecast, of up to 700,000 barrels a day by 2017, has evaporated as hole after hole came up dry. Chicontepec is now yielding only 35,000 barrels a day. The oil is contained in small pockets, and wet, hilly terrain makes it difficult to transport gear. Local corn farmers are slowing the drilling by blockading roads, demanding improvements like parks and pavement. “The oil is down there,” said Sergio Gómez, the Pemex production coordinator in Chicontepec. “The problem is getting it out of the ground.”

**And, Renewable Energy is winning the investment race**

American Council On Renewable Energy (**ACORE**), California Clean Energy Fund (CalCEF), **and Climate Policy Initiative 6/25** (ACORE, a 501(c)(3) non-profit membership organization, is dedicated to building a secure and prosperous America with clean, renewable energy. ACORE provides a common educational platform for a wide range of interests in the renewable energy community, focusing on technology, finance and policy. We convene thought leadership forums and create energy industry partnerships to communicate the economic, security and environmental benefits of renewable energy. Founded in 2004, the California Clean Energy Fund (CalCEF) is a family of non-profit organizations working together to accelerate the movement of clean energy technologies along the continuum from innovation to infrastructure. Using tools from finance, public policy and technological innovation, CalCEF pursues these goals at the local, state and national levels via three affiliated entities: CalCEF Ventures, an evergreen investment fund; CalCEF Innovations, which leads CalCEF’s analysis and solutions development; and CalCEF Catalyst, an industry acceleration platform. Climate Policy Initiative is an analysis and advisory organization that works to improve the most important energy and land use policies in the world. An independent, not-for-profit organization supported in part by a grant from the Open Society Foundations, CPI has offices and programs in Brazil, China, Europe, India, Indonesia, and the United States. “Strategies to Scale-Up U.S. Renewable Energy Investment” http://www.oregonwave.org/wp-content/uploads/Strategies-to-Scale-Up-US-Renewable-Energy-Investment.pdf)

Private sector investment in the U.S. renewable energy sector has grown significantly in recent years due in large part to manufacturing and technology cost reductions, state market demand policies, and federal tax policies. The combination of these factors has contributed to impressive growth for the renewable energy industry, and this scale in turn has further reduced technology costs. Over the past five years, more than 35% of all new power generation has come from renewable energy resources, including more than 49% of all new power generation in 2012 – surpassing all other energy sources, including natural gas. Since 2004, more than $300 billion has been invested in the U.S. clean energy market (PREF), including $35.6 billion6 in 2012, with a corresponding significant increase in jobs. Renewable energy generation also enhances energy security by harnessing clean domestic resources to produce more of the energy we consume here in the United States.

**B. Link – Expanded US/Mexico cooperation increases our dependence on Oil**

**Krauss and Malkin ’10** (“Mexico Oil Politics Keeps Riches Just Out of Reach” New York Times, Clifford Krauss and Elisabeth Malkin, March 8, 2010 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/09/business/global/09pemex.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

To the Mexican people, one of the great achievements in their history was the day their president kicked out foreign oil companies in 1938. Thus, they celebrate March 18 as a civic holiday. The effort to develop the geologically challenging Chicontepec field is deteriorating into an embarrassing setback for Pemex. Georgina Kessel, the energy secretary, estimated there are 50 billion barrels in potential oil reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. Yet today, that 72-year-old act has put Mexico in a straitjacket, one that threatens both the welfare of the country and the oil supply of the United States. The national oil company created after the 1938 seizure, Pemex, is entering a period of turmoil. Oil production in its aging fields is sagging so rapidly that Mexico, long one of the world’s top oil-exporting countries, could begin importing oil within the decade. Mexico is among the three leading foreign suppliers of oil to the United States, along with Canada and Saudi Arabia. Mexican barrels can be replaced, but at a cost. It means greater American dependence on unfriendly countries like Venezuela, unstable countries like Nigeria and Iraq, and on the oil sands of Canada, an environmentally destructive form of oil production. “As you lose Mexican oil, you lose a critical supply,” said Jeremy M. Martin, director of the energy program at the Institute of the Americas at the University of California, San Diego. “It’s not just about energy security but national security, because our neighbor’s economic and political well-being is largely linked to its capacity to produce and export oil.” Mexico probably still has plenty of oil, especially beneath the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico, but Pemex lacks the technology and know-how to get it out. Inviting foreign companies into the country to help is one of the touchiest propositions in Mexican politics. As the Mexican government struggles to find a way forward, production keeps falling. The basic problem is simply that Mexico’s readily accessible oil is used up — pretty much the same thing that happened to the United States when production began falling in the 1970s. Output from Mexico’s giant Cantarell field, in shallow waters near the eastern shore, has plunged by 50 percent in recent years. Output at the country’s other large field is expected to begin falling in the next year or two. Historically, oil has supplied 30 to 40 percent of the Mexican government’s revenue. Confronting a potential calamity, President Felipe Calderón has pushed through the strongest reforms he can defend politically, in hopes of attracting foreign investment. But he dare not do anything that would appear to reverse the 1938 nationalization. Even the modest reforms he has managed to pass are being challenged in court. Officially, the government is optimistic that Mexico can reverse its decline as an oil-producing nation. But its efforts so far have yielded more rhetoric than oil. Last year, on the day celebrating the 1938 seizure, the president’s helicopter landed in a hilly oil field outside this farming town. He announced that a new era of Mexican gushers would dawn soon. “Under this soil,” Mr. Calderón told thousands of oil workers, lay “the richness that could propel development in our country and help Mexico accelerate our path to progress and well-being.” He promised that 20 wells would be spurting crude “very soon” from the ground on which he stood. Almost a year later, only three wells were pumping on a recent afternoon. Eleven had been shut after producing little or no oil. In fact, the effort to develop the geologically challenging Chicontepec field here, near the gulf coast, is deteriorating into an embarrassing disaster for Pemex, the latest in a string of them.

**C. Internal Link – Reliance on oil production crushes the transition to renewables**

**CBO, 2012** (Congressional Budget Office, “Energy Security in the United States”, May, http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/05-09-EnergySecurity.pdf)

Even if world oil prices declined as a result of increased U.S. production, most households and businesses would not be substantially less vulnerable to future oil disruptions, for two reasons. First, **an expectation by consumers of sustained lower prices would provide an incentive** for households and businesses **to make long-run decisions**— that is, decisions that cannot easily be reversed in the near term—that ultimately increased their reliance on oil. For example, a reduction in gasoline prices would decrease the cost of using less-fuel-efficient vehicles or living far from work. Similarly, if industries expected lower oil prices, they would have less incentive to develop alternative fuel supplies (such as natural gas or electricity) for personal or public transportation. As a result, lower prices might induce households and businesses to increase their reliance on oil in the transportation sector and, thus, increase their exposure to disruptions in the supply of oil. Second, even though oil prices might be slightly lower if oil production was increased, a reduction in cost of a few dollars per barrel would be small compared with the price fluctuations that are common to the oil market. Between 2001 and 2011, price changes of $60 to $90 per barrel of oil occurred. Thus, increased domestic production would leave the vulnerability of most consumers to disruptions in oil markets largely unchanged.38

**D. Impact – Renewable Transition is critical to solve global warming**

**Leahy, ’11** (Stephen, Independent environmental journalist for 16 years, “Permafrost Melt Soon Irreversible Without Major Fossil Fuel Cuts”, Feb 21, http://www.countercurrents.org/leahy210911.htm)

UXBRIDGE - Thawing permafrost is threatening to overwhelm attempts to keep the planet from getting **too hot for** human **survival.** Without major reductions in the use of fossil fuels, as much as two-thirds of the world's gigantic storehouse of frozen carbon could be released, a new study reported. That would push global temperatures several degrees higher, making large parts of the planet **uninhabitable**. Once the Arctic gets warm enough, the carbon and methane emissions from thawing permafrost will kick-start a feedback that will **amplify the current warming rate,** says Kevin Schaefer, a scientist at the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) in Boulder, Colorado. That will likely be **irreversible**. And **we're less than 20 years from this tipping point**. Schaefer prefers to use the term "starting point" for when the 13 million square kilometres of permafrost in Alaska, Canada, Siberia and parts of Europe becomes a major new source of carbon emissions. "Our model projects a starting point 15 to 20 years from now," Schaefer told IPS. The model used a 'middle of the road' scenario with less fossil fuel use than at present. Even at that rate, it found that between 29 and 60 percent of the world's permafrost will thaw, releasing an extra 190 gigatonnes of carbon by 2200. The study is the first to quantify when and how much carbon will be released and was published this week in the meteorological journal Tellus. "The amount of carbon released is equivalent to half the amount of carbon that has been released into the atmosphere since the dawn of the industrial age," Schaefer said. The additional carbon from permafrost would increase the average temperatures in the Arctic by **eight to 10 degrees C**, the study reported. Not only would this utterly transform the Arctic, it would also increase the planet's average temperature by about three degrees C, agrees Schaefer. And this increase would be on top of the three to six degrees C from continuing to burn fossil fuels over the next 100 years. The Earth's normal average temperature is 14C, so heating up the entire planet another six to nine degrees C would be like increasing our body temperatures from the normal 37C to a deadly fever of 53 to 60 degrees C. As catastrophic as all this is, Schaefer acknowledges his study underestimates what is likely to happen. The model does not measure methane releases, which are 40 times as potent in terms of warming as carbon. Methane could have a big impact on temperatures in the short term, he says. "There would be a lot of methane emissions. We're working on estimating those right now," he said. The model also does not include emissions from the large region of underwater permafrost. IPS previously reported that an estimated eight million tonnes of methane emissions are bubbling to the surface from the shallow East Siberian Arctic shelf every year. If just one percent of the Arctic undersea methane (also called methane hydrates) reaches the atmosphere, it could quadruple the amount of methane currently in the atmosphere, Vladimir Romanovsky of the University of Alaska in Fairbanks previously told IPS. Nor does the model account for a process called thermokarst erosion, acknowledges Schaefer. This is a widely observed process where meltwater erodes the permafrost and exposes it to warmer temperatures and speeding up the thaw. "We can't model that yet but it could contribute to major releases of carbon and methane," he said. None of this has been taken into account by politicians and policy makers looking to cut humanity's carbon emissions with the agreed on target of keeping global temperatures below two degrees C. Nor is there a wide appreciation for the fact there is no 'reverse gear'. Even if all fossil fuel use stopped today, global temperatures would continue to rise and permafrost would thaw for another 20 to 30 years, Schaefer estimates. And once the permafrost carbon is released, "there is no way to put it back into the permafrost". Even if there was a way to lower the Earth's human-induced fever, it would take a century or more for thawed permafrost to reform, he said. Permafrost has been warming and thawing since the 1980s. A 2009 study reported that the southernmost permafrost limit had retreated 130 kilometres over the past 50 years in Quebec's James Bay region. The major loss of sea ice in the Arctic allows the Arctic Ocean to become much warmer, which in turn has increased temperatures of coastal regions an average of three to five degrees C warmer than 30 years ago. More ominously, large parts of the eastern Arctic were 21C higher above normal for a month in the dead of winter this year, as previously reported by IPS. However, while on the edge of a most dangerous precipice, there is a safer path available. A new energy analysis demonstrates that fossil fuel energy could be virtually phased out by 2050 while offering comfortable lifestyles for all. The Energy Report by Ecofys, a leading energy consulting firm in the Netherlands, shows that humanity could meet 95 percent of energy needs with renewables utilising today's technologies. "The Energy Report shows that in four decades we can have a world of vibrant economies and societies powered entirely by clean, cheap and renewable energy and with a vastly improved quality of life," said WWF Director General Jim Leape. WWF worked on the report with Ecofys. "The report is more than a scenario – it's a call for action. We can achieve a cleaner, renewable future, **but we must start now,**" Leape said in a statement.

**And, Positive feedbacks ensure runaway warming, causes extinction**

**Speth 2008** [James, dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Currently he serves the school as the Carl W. Knobloch, Jr. Dean and Sara Shallenberger Brown Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy, The Bridge @ the Edge of the World, pg. 26]

The possibility of abrupt climate change is linked to what may be the most problematic possibility of all—"positive" feedback effects where the initial warming has effects that generate more warming. Several of these feedbacks are possible. First, the land's ability to store carbon could weaken. Soils and forests can dry out or burn and release carbon; less plant growth can occur, thus reducing nature's ability to remove carbon from the air. Second, carbon sinks in the oceans could also be reduced due to ocean warming and other factors. Third, the potent greenhouse gas methane could be released from peat bogs, wetlands, and thawing permafrost, and even from the methane hydrates in the oceans, as the planet warms and changes. Finally, the earth's albedo, the reflectivity of the earth's surface, is slated to be reduced as large areas now covered by ice and snow diminish or are covered by meltwater. All these effects would tend to make warming self-reinforcing, possibly leading to a greatly amplified greenhouse effect. The real possibility of these amplifying feedbacks has alarmed some of our top scientists. James Hansen, the courageous NASA climate scientist, is becoming increasingly outspoken as his investigations lead him to more and more disturbing conclusions. He offered the following assessment in 2007: "Our home planet is now dangerously near a 'tipping point.' Human-made greenhouse gases are near a level such that important climate changes may proceed mostly under the climate system's own momentum. Impacts would include extermination of a large fraction of species on the planet, shifting of climatic zones due to an intensified hydrologic cycle with effects on freshwater availability and human health, and repeated worldwide coastal tragedies associated with storms and a continuously rising sea level. .. . "Civilization developed during the Holocene, a period of relatively tranquil climate now almost 12,000 years in duration. The planet has been warm enough to keep ice sheets off North America and Europe, but cool enough for ice sheets on Greenland and Antarctica to be stable. Now, with rapid warming of o.6°C in the past 30 years, global temperature is at its warmest level in the Holocene. "This warming has brought us to the precipice of a great 'tipping point” If we go over the edge, it will be a transition to 'a different planet,' an environment far outside the range that has been experienced by humanity. There will be no return within the lifetime of any generation that can be imagined, and the trip will exterminate a large fraction of species on the planet.

### China CP

#### Chinese-Mexican Investment mutually beneficial—kickstarts tech, trade, and overall development

**Xuequan- 6/6** (Mu, , “Chinese President Urges joint efforts to expand economic cooperation with Mexico,” *Xinhuanet*, 6/6/13, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2013-06/06/c\_124818247.htm)

MEXICO CITY, June 5 (Xinhua) -- Visiting Chinese President Xi Jinping on Wednesday called for joint efforts from business communities of China and Mexico to expand the two countries' economic cooperation. Both China and Mexico stand at a crucial stage of development, and the two emerging economies are complementary in such domains as resources, technology, capital and market, Xi said at a conference attended by Chinese and Mexican entrepreneurs. He noted that China and Mexico have just agreed to upgrade their bilateral relations to a comprehensive strategic partnership, which creates a more favorable condition and opens up a vaster space for the development of their trade and economic cooperation. The Chinese president urged both sides to always see each other as partner and important opportunity for development, and to strengthen China-Mexico economic and trade cooperation from a strategic perspective. Xi said that the two countries should foster new growth points for bilateral investment in such areas as energy, mining, infrastructure and high-tech industry, while tapping the full potential of their cooperation in traditional fields. The two sides should work in the spirit of mutual respect and mutual benefit to optimize their trade structure, resolve their differences through amicable negotiations and seek trade balance in an active manner, he said. Xi urged entrepreneurs on both sides to work jointly to increase their mutual understanding and strengthen strategic cooperation so as to push China-Mexico economic and trade cooperation to a higher level. Addressing the same conference, Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto said China is an important partner for Mexico, and the upgrade of bilateral ties to comprehensive strategic partnership has opened broad prospects for economic and trade cooperation between the two countries. He said the two countries should explore new areas and new means of cooperation so as to promote a more balanced growth of bilateral trade and achieve win-win results. Mexico is willing to create favorable conditions to attract more Chinese investment, he added.

# case

### North American Integration

#### The plan causes a huge protectionist backlash

Field 12 (Alan M, “Will protectionist murmurs deter efforts to forge even closer economic integration”, July 5, <http://www.canadiansailings.ca/?p=4319#sthash.EBghHG0k.dpuf>, CMR)

Although current NAFTA provisions for labour are “archaic,” said Ms. Greenwood, she is encouraged by the progress the U.S. and Canada are making in their Beyond the Border initiatives. For his part, Dr. Pastor argues that such initiatives don’t get nearly far enough to use joint North American resources to solve the common problems of the continent. He proposes that the transportation ministers of Canada, the U.S. and Mexico should negotiate a North American Plan for Infrastructure and Transportation, to create new trade corridors that would extend from Canada all the way to south Mexico. **He added** that **leaders** of the three countries **should** also **eliminate their costly NAFTA ‘rules of origin**,’ – complex barriers to trade that he said were an “inefficient tax estimated at over $500 million per year.” The three countries should also establish a common external tariff whose revenues would fund a North American Investment Fund, whose main goal would be to fund infrastructure and transportation, added Pastor. Among other new institutions would be a lean North American Commission on Regulatory Convergence, which would “do research and provide options for the three governments to improve competitiveness and security in North America.”¶ No doubt, **such bold initiatives will strike many as being far too ambitious to attract widespread political support in** either Canada, **the U.S**. or Mexico. In each of these countries, **protectionist forces are** well-entrenched**,** and many oppose any initiative that would seem to cede too much power to foreign governments and international institutions. Nevertheless, the countries’ leaders may gradually be impelled to move at least part of the way toward such bold solutions as their economies becoming increasingly integrated – and yet equally challenged by competition from other regions of the world.

#### That will force Obama to bash NAFTA – turns case

O’Brien 8 (Dan, Senior Editor – Economic Intelligence Unit, “Our Vested Interest in a McCain Win”, Sunday Business Post, 11-2, <http://www.sbpost.ie/post/pages/p/story.aspx-qqqt=GUEST+WRITER-qqqs=commentandanalysis-qqqid=37213-qqqx=1.asp>, CMR)

Anti-globalisation sentiment is widespread in the Democratic Party, which has traditionally been less supportive of economic openness than the Republicans. The Democratic-controlled Congress has opposed free trade agreements and, since 2007, has refused the extension of presidential powers to negotiate trade deals without having for itself line-by-line veto power. This is one of the reasons why the Doha round of multilateral trade talks continues to languish.¶ As for Obama himself, he has not shied away from protectionist rhetoric during the campaign. But, in fairness, his bite is unlikely to match his bark. His economic advisers are mostly solid internationalists, and one of them, Austan Goolsbee, let slip earlier in the year that Obama would not act on his threats of economic nationalism if elected.¶ How could these factors come together and play out in relation to Ireland? By far the greatest threat is a change to the US corporation tax code. Many voices are now calling for US companies to be taxed on worldwide earnings in their home country.¶ If American companies located in Ireland were obliged to pay the US rate of 35 per cent, it would mean that, on top of the 12.5 per cent of their profits booked in Ireland, which go to the Department of Finance, an additional 22.5 per cent would go to the treasury in Washington DC.¶ US companies, which directly and indirectly employ one in ten people at work in Ireland, operate here for many reasons, but tax is undoubtedly of key importance. Data on output per worker in the sectors in which US companies dominate show that Irish workers produce more (often far more) than their counterparts elsewhere. There can be little doubt that this is attributable far less to the heroic toiling of Irish workers and far more to transfer pricing, which, put simply, is a method of inter-jurisdictional tax avoidance.¶ Obama has made noises about closing what many Americans consider to be a loophole. US businesses will lobby hard against this, arguing that it would put them at a competitive disadvantage. But as the US fiscal position weakens and as anti-business sentiment becomes shriller, making companies pay more tax in the US may be both necessary and popular.¶ If the US revamped its tax regime along those lines, it would fundamentally change the way American companies view their international operations in general, and their Irish operations in particular. Companies already in Ireland would be more likely to divest, and attracting new ones would be far more difficult.¶ Under a McCain presidency, the existing tax code would be safe, because he believes it is good for American companies and good for America. Reassuringly for Ireland, he even cited approvingly the country's low corporation tax rate in a TV debate with Obama.¶ On trade, the differences between the candidates are narrower. Philip Gordon, who was director for Europe at the national security council during the Clinton administration, is among the hot favourites to take responsibility for Europe at the state department under Obama. At a conference in Barcelona in June, he stressed Obama's commitment to bilateral trade links with Europe, and the importance of the multilateral trading system centred around the World Trade Organisation.¶ Pragmatic Republicans don't doubt the Obama commitments to avoid roll-back on trade. At a think-in of policy wonks and journalists in Slovakia two weeks ago, John Hulsman of the German Council on Foreign Relations, a hard-headed and worldly Republican, stated that, while Obama would not push for trade liberalisation, he was unlikely to go in the opposite direction.¶ But whether, against his better judgment, Obama will be able to resist moving in a protectionist direction is moot. Europeans rarely realise that their prime ministers are far more powerful domestically than American presidents are in the US. Where European parliaments have limited powers over the executive branch of government, the US Congress can make life impossible for presidents.¶ In order to get anything done, Obama will have to horse-trade with Congress. If demands for protectionism in the US rise, Congress will pander and even inflame. Legislators could call the president on his campaign promises, such as the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Obama may not be able to resist

### Energy

#### Mexico can’t be a major producer --- too many barriers, lack of interest

Duffy 12

Aimee, “Busting the Myth of Energy Independence”, Aug 28, <http://www.dailyfinance.com/2012/08/28/busting-the-myth-of-energy-independence/>, CMR

Assumption No. 2: Everything is fine in Mexico ¶ To put it simply, Mexico's oil industry is a giant disaster. How can we expect "North American Energy Independence by 2020" when Mexico's production has declined 25% since 2004? Some analysts predict that if Pemex, the country's national oil company, doesn't get its act together, it will become a net importer of oil by 2020. The very same year, the entire continent is supposed to reach its goal of energy independence.¶ Pemex has had a monopoly on the Mexican oil industry since 1938. The country's constitution forbids production-sharing agreements with foreign oil companies, which is why ExxonMobil (NYS: XOM) and the rest of Big Oil don't bother doing serious business there. The only agreements that are allowed are service contracts, which pay a set fee per barrel and forbid any company other than Pemex from owning the crude that is produced.¶ There is a growing consensus that Pemex needs to open its doors to foreign expertise to increase oil production, but change is painfully slow in coming. In an effort to test this idea of openness, this past June the government offered to allow foreign companies the right to bid for the operational control, but not ownership, of seven separate oil fields across the country.¶ But the auctions were only moderately successful, as Pemex failed to award two offshore fields to foreign operators. All the bids for one field were too expensive and thus rejected, and there were no bids for the other field. There is increasing skepticism that while the Mexican government may want to open up the industry, Pemex is quite content to continue to run its own show.¶ Regardless, until there is a significant change in Mexican energy-production policy, it seems foolish to rely on the country for an increase in imports.

#### With oil and gas production developing so rapidly, the US is projected to become self-sufficient in the near future.

Domm, 2013 (Patti, CNBC Executive News Editor, “US Is on Fast-Track to Energy Independence: Study” CNBC, http://www.cnbc.com/id/100450133, LL)

U.S. oil and gas production is evolving so rapidly—and demand is dropping so quickly—that in just five years the U.S. could no longer need to buy oil from any source but Canada, according to Citigroup's global head of commodities research.¶ Citigroup's Edward Morse, in a new report, projects a dramatic reshaping of the global energy industry, where the U.S., in a matter of years, becomes an exporter of energy, instead of one of the biggest importers.¶ The shift could sharply reduce the price of oil, and therefore limit the revenues of the producing nations of OPEC, as well as Russia and West Africa. Those nations face new challenges: not only are the U.S. and Canada increasing output, but Iraq increasingly is realizing its potential as an oil producer, adding 600,000 barrels a day of production annually for the next several years.¶ "OPEC will find it challenging to survive another 60 years, let alone another decade," the report by Morse and other Citi analysts said. "But not all of the consequences are positive, for when it comes to the geopolitics of energy, the likely outcomes are asymmetric, with clear cut winner and losers." (Read More: The World's 15 Biggest Oil Producers)¶ The U.S. is a winner in many ways. Its super power status could be prolonged because of this new growth in oil and shale gas production, made possible by "fracking" and other non-conventional drilling technologies.¶ Crude oil generated the largest single annual increase in liquids production in U.S. history last year, with an increase of 1.16 million barrels per day. Oil production is booming in places like Texas and North Dakota, which has the lowest unemployment in the country at just 3 percent last September, compared to the national rate of 7.8 percent then.¶ Citi analysts also foresee a new era of U.S. industrialization, fueled by cheaper power. They cite dozens of industrial projects across America that have already begun or are planned, in such industries as auto, chemicals and steel. (Read More: Winter Storm May Stall Gas Price Climb)¶ The oil producing nations of OPEC, and others, will have to adjust to a world of lower prices. Separately, OPEC, in its February report Tuesday, commented about the U.S., noting the US is the fastest growing producer this year among the non-OPEC nations. "Starting this year, North American output, as we indicate in this report, should start to have tangible impacts both on global prices and trading patterns, and will eventually turn the global geopolitics of energy on its head," the report said.¶ Morse surprised markets a year ago with a report that envisioned the U.S. as part of an energy independent North America. Since then, the view has become mainstream. The International Energy Agency forecast last fall that the U.S. will overtake Saudi Arabia and Russia as the top oil producer by 2017. The IEA also forecast that North America could become a net oil exporter by around 2030 and the U.S. could become nearly self-sufficient by 2035.¶ Morse's latest report, released Tuesday, has an even more aggressive view of the U.S. move to dominance as an energy producer.¶ If crude oil and field condensates, natural gas liquids, renewable fuels and refinery processing gains are counted, the report put U.S. production at 11.2 million barrels per day at the end of 2012, making the U.S. the biggest oil producer already last year.¶ Asked how his report has been received so far, Morse said, with an ironic laugh, that he's had some "push back but not as much as last year."

#### Turn: North American energy independence collapses overseas oil producers – leads to global chaos and instability – turns the case

YAKABUSKI 13 (Konrad, “The downsides of U.S. energy independence”, May 13, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/commentary/the-downsides-of-us-energy-independence/article11869851/>, CMR)

What gets mentioned less are the downsides of energy independence. Rising U.S. and Canadian oil production could well destabilize petro-states in the Middle East, Russia, Africa and beyond, sparking regime changes unfavourable to U.S. interests and creating an even riskier world.¶ The trauma of the 1973 Arab oil embargo fuelled America’s obsession with energy security. That obsession only intensified with declining domestic production as conventional oil wells dried up. The failure to halt ever-rising dependence on foreign oil became a source of national shame and resentment, humbling successive U.S. presidents into holding hands with Saudi oil sheiks.¶ In just a few short years, however, the United States has experienced a stunning reversal of its energy fortunes. As recently as 2005, the country was importing an average of 12.5 million barrels of oil every day, which was 60 per cent of domestic consumption. By last year, oil imports were down to 7.4 million barrels per day, 40 per cent of consumption. Next year, imports are expected to average 5.7 million barrels a day, 30 per cent of domestic demand, according to last week’s forecast by the U.S. Energy Information Administration.¶ A sharp drop in consumption since the recession, along with better fuel efficiency in new cars, partly explains the improving U.S. balance of oil trade. But mostly, it stems from new technology that has freed up previously inaccessible oil reserves, leading to a surge in U.S. production. From barely five million barrels of oil a day in 2008, domestic production will surpass 7.1 million barrels this year and reach 8.5 million barrels by the end of 2014. Some analysts think the U.S. will overtake Saudi Arabia as the world’s biggest oil producer as early as 2017.¶ The paradox, however, is that both Canada and the U.S. need oil prices to remain high in order to keep production rising. Otherwise, the development of U.S. shale reserves and Canadian oil sands becomes a money-losing proposition and the resource will stay in the ground. So, North American oil independence cannot go hand in hand with a break at the gas pump for North American consumers.¶ That should provide some comfort to environmentalists who see rising production here as a nightmare scenario. High gasoline prices should continue to discourage consumption and serve as an incentive to attain even higher fuel efficiency standards and develop alternatives to the internal combustion engine.¶ Declining U.S. imports from the Middle East and Africa could, however, wreak political havoc in those regions. Nigeria and Angola have already seen their oil exports to North America slow to a trickle. They will increasingly compete with Middle Eastern countries to supply Asian markets, a development Citigroup analyst Edward Morse predicts will be “highly disruptive.”¶ In his new book The Power Surge, Michael Levi of the Council on Foreign Relations warns: “If Middle Eastern oil producers conclude that rising U.S. oil production will weaken U.S. interest in the region, they’ll take steps to build alliances with other world powers. If leaders in Beijing believe that the United States will no longer be as interested in protecting critical sea lanes that link Middle Eastern oil markets to the wider world, they’ll build up their navy more quickly.”¶ OPEC nations cannot afford to see rising North American production drive down global oil prices, either. Were that to happen, it would sow political unrest in places like Saudi Arabia that have been shamelessly buying off their populations to keep the Arab Spring at bay. The consequences of regime change in Saudi Arabia could be deeply unsettling for global security.¶ U.S. freedom from Middle Eastern oil cannot, alas, mean freedom from Middle Eastern politics.

### Immigration

#### Illegal immigration from Mexico declining

Muskal 12/6/12 (Michael, “Illegal immigration to U.S. stays down, Pew's latest numbers show”, <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/dec/06/nation/la-na-nn-pew-illegal-immigration-down-20121206>, CMR)

There are about 11.1 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States, a figure that has remained relatively constant over the last two years, according to the latest estimates released Thursday by the Pew Hispanic Center.¶ The numbers come as President Obama prepares to push immigration reform as a key part of his second-term agenda. They also come as analyses highlight the greater role Latinos played in the recent presidential election.¶ The 11.1-million figure compares with 11.2 million in 2010 and 11.1 million in 2009.¶ The number of illegal immigrants in the U.S., which stood at about 8.4 million in 2000, peaked at about 12 million in 2007 and has been tapering since, according to the analysis prepared by demographers Jeffrey Passel and D’Vera Cohn of the Hispanic Center, part of the Pew Research Center.¶ The decrease was driven mainly by a drop in the number of immigrants arriving from Mexico, the largest source of migration to the U.S. The Pew Hispanic Center reported earlier this year that net immigration from Mexico to the United States had stopped and possibly reversed through 2010.¶ At the peak, about 770,000 immigrants were arriving annually from Mexico, the majority of them illegally. By 2010, the inflow had dropped to about 140,000, and the majority arrived legally, according to the center’s estimates.

### Solvency

#### Plan fails and will be rejected – internal reform is a pre-requisite to investment

Hufbauer & Scott ‘5

Reginald Jones Senior Fellow since ’92, was the Marcus

Wallenberg Professor of Int’l Finance Diplomacy @ Georgetown University, AND Jeffrey J, senior fellow, joined the Inst for Int’l Economic in ’83, visiting lecturer @ Princeton, “NAFTA Revisited: Achievements and Challenges”, page number below

To generate significant sums required for such investments, Mexico will need to attract both domestic and foreign funds. First, however, the Mexican government must pursue domestic economic reforms that generate substantial new revenues for the Mexican Treasury and create a more conducive policy environment for new investment. Only then should consideration be given to regional initiatives that pool contributions from the United States and Canada for Mexican infrastructure projects. Without prior domestic reforms, proposals to leverage foreign assistance to Mexico – including a North American Investment Fund – would likely be rejected out of hand. Indeed, it would be counterproductive to ask Washington and Ottawa to subsidize Mexican infrastructure investment unless the Mexican government is first willing to tap its own resources. [page 472-473]

#### No chance the plan solves – only trilateral cooperation with Canada can ensure successful integration

Pastor 12 – prof and director of the Center for North American Studies @ American

Robert A, Beyond the Continental Divide, July/August, <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1269>, CMR

The problem is that our leaders do not think continentally. As long as they persist in focusing on bilateral or Asian relationships, they will be blind to the promise and the problems of North America. At base, today’s problems are the result of the three governments’ failure to govern the North American space for mutual benefit. Once they visualize “North America” and decide to approach their problems from a continental perspective, solutions will appear that were previously invisible. ¶ None of the many proposals that have been advanced for the region can be achieved without such a vision. Americans and Canadians will not contribute to a North American Investment Fund to narrow the development gap with Mexico without being convinced that Mexico’s growth will benefit their countries. There is little prospect of reaching an agreement on labor mobility, harmonizing environmental standards, forging a transportation plan, or most any proposal that would cost money or change the status quo unless there is a vision of a wider community that could attract the support of the people and their legislatures. The right vision can inspire the three nations to rethink North America and incorporate the idea into our consciousness and policies. We can be more than the sum of our three great countries, but only if we first see the possibility.

#### Plan won’t secure long-term investment – countries not convinced of benefits

Pastor 13 – Professor and Director of the Center for North American Studies at American University (Robert A, “Speed Bumps, Potholes, and Roadblocks on the North American Superhighway”, Winter, Lexis, CMR)

None of the many proposals that have been advanced for the region can be achieved without such a vision. Americans and Canadians will not provide funds to a North American Investment Fund to narrow the development gap with Mexico without a convincing vision of how Mexico's growth will benefit their countries. There is little prospect of reaching an agreement on labor mobility, on harmonizing environmental standards, on forging a transportation plan, or any proposal that would cost money or change the status quo unless there is a vision of a wider Community that could attract the support of the people and their legislatures.